



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,784	06/27/2001	Frank Bahren	Westphal.6311	9616
7590	04/28/2005		EXAMINER	
Patrick J. O'Shea O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C. 1500 Main Street Suite 912 Springfield, MA 01115			CHANKONG, DOHM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	
			DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/892,784	BAHREN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dohm Chankong	2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1> Applicant's amendment and remarks have been received. Claims 11-30 are presented for further examination.

Response to Arguments

2> Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment that alters the scope of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3> The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless - (e) the invention was described in (i) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4> Claims 11-14, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Jha, U.S Patent No. 6,771,663.

5> As to claim 11, Jha discloses a data telegram for transmitting data in a network that specifies a first data transmission protocol for the transmitted data in accordance with a host network standard, the data telegram comprising:

a data section containing data formatted in accordance with an extraneous standard that is different than the host network standard [column 5 «lines 52-55» | column 7 «lines 39-60» where the host network standard is SONET]; and

a header section having a predetermined region that contains information specifying that the data within the data section are formatted according to the extraneous standard [column 5 «line 67» to column 6 «line 5» | column 9 «lines 55-60»].

6> As to claim 12, Jha discloses the data telegram of claim 11, wherein the information is contained in a place in the header section that is otherwise unoccupied [Figure 9 | column 9 «lines 55-60»].

7> As to claim 13, Jha discloses the data telegram of claim 11, wherein the information is contained in a place in the header section that is reserved for information that is not relevant to the host network standard [column 9 «lines 55-58»].

8> As to claim 14, Jha discloses the data telegram of claim 11, wherein the data telegram is divided into frames, the frames into blocks, and the blocks into bytes [Figure 7 | column 8 «lines 20-42»].

9> As to claim 18, Jha discloses the data telegram of claim 11, wherein the extraneous standard corresponds to the Internet Protocol (IP) standard [column 7 «lines 46-49»].

10> As to claim 20, Jha discloses the data telegram of claim 11, wherein the header section of the data telegram is formatted in accordance with the host network standard [column 7 «lines 39-60» where the host network standard is SONET (use of the payload envelope)].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12> Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jha, in view of the MOST Specification Framework Rev. 1.1 [“MOST spec”] and Saito, U.S Patent No. 6,373,844.

13> As to claim 15, Jha does disclose a header section with the information contained in the header [column 9 «lines 20-30»] but does not specifically disclose a data telegram wherein the first data transmission protocol is MOST and the host network standard is the MOST standard, and wherein the header section comprises five bytes with the information contained in the last byte of the header section.

14> The MOST spec discloses a data telegram wherein the first data transmission

protocol is MOST and the host network standard is the MOST standard [section 2.1 | section 3 | section 6 ("MOST Frame Structure")]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the MOST protocol and standard in Jha's network to obtain MOST's advantages of increasing the speed of the network and decreasing cost of technology in automotive environments. Jha suggests this implementation as his network is fully compatible with current and future optical (fiber) networks [column 14 «lines 1-23»].

15> As to the matter of the 5 byte header, the length of a header is merely a design choice and therefore is not a patentable distinction over the prior art. Additionally Saito discloses that a header section of a frame can comprise of five bytes with the information contained in the last byte of the header section [column 1 «line 60» to column 2 «line 1»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the five byte header into Jha's frame to help identify the protocol of the data that is contained in the payload of the frame.

16> As to claim 16, Jha does not explicitly disclose a data telegram wherein the network is a MOST network in which data are transmitted by means of MOST telegrams having a header section of five bytes, wherein the information is contained in a telegram identification portion in the last byte of the header section.

17> The MOST spec discloses a data telegram wherein the network is a MOST network

in which data are transmitted by means of MOST telegrams having a header [section 2.1 | section 4 | section 6 (“MOST Frame Structure”)]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the Livermore’s ring network and frames as a MOST network and MOST telegrams respectively, to obtain MOST’s advantages and functionality of increasing the speed of the network and decreasing cost of technology in automotive environments.

18> As to the matter of the 5 byte header, the length of a header is merely a design choice and therefore is not a patentable distinction over the prior art. Additionally Saito discloses that a header section of a frame can comprise of five bytes with the information contained in the last byte of the header section [column 1 «line 60» to column 2 «line 1»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the five byte header into Jha’s frame to help identify the protocol of the data that is contained in the payload of the frame.

19> Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jha, in view of in view of Flanders et al, U.S Patent No. 6,172,980 [“Flanders”].

20> As to claim 17, Jha discloses that his network is suited for transporting data of extraneous standards [column 14 «lines 24-30»], but does not explicitly disclose that the extraneous standard corresponds to the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) standard.

21> Flanders teaches a data telegram wherein the extraneous standard is TCP [column 7

<lines 12-14>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement TCP as the extraneous standard for Jha's data telegram, as TCP is a ubiquitous standard in the network arts.

22> As to claim 19, Jha discloses that his network is suited for transporting data of extraneous standards and especially packets [column 14 <lines 24-30>], but does not explicitly disclose that the extraneous standard corresponds to the Internet Packet Exchange protocol (IPX) standard.

23> Flanders teaches a data telegram wherein the extraneous standard is IPX [column 6 <lines 8-11>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement IPX as the extraneous standard for Jha's data telegram, as IPX is a ubiquitous standard in the network arts.

24> Claims 11-14, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livermore et al, U.S Patent No. 6,542,511 ["Livermore"], in view of Jha.

25> As to claim 11, Livermore discloses a data telegram for transmitting data in a network that specifies a first data transmission protocol for the transmitted data in accordance with a host network standard [column 3 <lines 26-34 and 40-44> where : Livermore's host network standard is defined by the use of container structures], the data telegram comprising:
a data section containing data formatted in accordance with an extraneous standard

that is different than the host network standard [column 3 «lines 7-13 and 26-34»]; and a header section [Figure 5].

Livermore does not explicitly disclose that the header section has a predetermined region that contains information specifying that the data within the data section are formatted according to the extraneous standard.

26> Livermore discloses placing different traffic classes within the same container; as such, one of ordinary skill in the art would realize a specific need to identify each of these traffic types within the container so that they can be differentiated when they are transported to their destinations. In this regard, Jha discloses a network similar to Livermore [a hybrid data transport over optical networks], and specifically, a header section having a predetermined region that contains information specifying that the data within the data section are formatted according to the extraneous standard [column 7 «lines 46-49»]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Jha's header functionality into Livermore's header to enable identification of the multiple traffic types (standards) of the data payload. Furthermore, Livermore explicitly states the possibility of expanding the use of his header functions [column 6 «lines 34-35»].

27> As to claim 12, Livermore discloses the data telegram of claim 11, wherein information is contained in a place in the header section that is otherwise unoccupied [column 6 «lines 34-35»], but does not explicitly disclose that it is information specifying that the data is formatted according to the extraneous standard.

28> Jha discloses the information is contained in a place in the header [column 7 «lines 46-49»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Jha's header functionality into Livermore's header to enable identification of the multiple traffic types (standards) of the data payload.

29> As to claim 13, Livermore disclose the data telegram of claim 11 wherein information is contained in a place in the header section that is reserved for information that is not relevant to the host network standard [column 6 «lines 27-35»] but does not explicitly disclose that it is information specifying that the data is formatted according to the extraneous standard.

30> Jha discloses the information is contained in a place in the header [column 7 «lines 43-49»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Jha's header functionality into Livermore's header to enable identification of the multiple traffic types (standards) of the data payload.

31> As to claim 14, Livermore discloses the data telegram of claim 11, wherein the data telegram is divided into frames, the frames into blocks, and the blocks into bytes [column 6 «lines 16-26»].

32> As to claim 18, Livermore discloses the data telegram of claim 11, wherein the

extraneous standard corresponds to the Internet Protocol (IP) standard [column 6 <lines 47-51>].

33> As to claim 20, Livermore discloses the data telegram of claim 11, wherein the header section of the data telegram is formatted in accordance with the host network standard [column 6 <lines 29-31>].

34> Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livermore and Jha, in view of the MOST spec and Saito.

35> As to claim 15, Livermore and Jha do disclose a header section with the information contained in the header [see Livermore, column 6 «lines 16-23»] but do not specifically disclose a data telegram wherein the first data transmission protocol is MOST and the host network standard is the MOST standard, and wherein the header section comprises five bytes with the information contained in the last byte of the header section.

36> The MOST spec discloses a data telegram wherein the first data transmission protocol is MOST and the host network standard is the MOST standard [section 2.1 | section 3 | section 6 (“MOST Frame Structure”)]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the MOST protocol and standard in Livermore’s network to obtain MOST’s advantages of increasing the speed of the network and decreasing cost of technology in automotive environments. Livermore suggests

this implementation as his network is fully compatible with current and future optical (fiber) networks [Figure 3 | column 3 <lines 64-67>].

37> As to the matter of the 5 byte header, the length of a header is merely a design choice and therefore is not a patentable distinction over the prior art. Additionally Saito discloses that a header section of a frame can comprise of five bytes with the information contained in the last byte of the header section [column 1 «line 60» to column 2 «line 1»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the five byte header into Livermore's frame to help identify the protocol of the data that is contained in the payload of the frame.

38> As to claim 16, Livermore does not explicitly disclose a data telegram wherein the network is a MOST network in which data are transmitted by means of MOST telegrams having a header section of five bytes, wherein the information is contained in a telegram identification portion in the last byte of the header section.

39> The MOST spec discloses a data telegram wherein the network is a MOST network in which data are transmitted by means of MOST telegrams having a header [section 2.1 | section 4 | section 6 ("MOST Frame Structure")]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the Livermore's ring network and frames as a MOST network and MOST telegrams respectively, to obtain

MOST's advantages and functionality of increasing the speed of the network and decreasing cost of technology in automotive environments.

40> As to the matter of the 5 byte header, the length of a header is merely a design choice and therefore is not a patentable distinction over the prior art. Additionally Saito discloses that a header section of a frame can comprise of five bytes with the information contained in the last byte of the header section [column 1 <line 60> to column 2 <line 1>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the five byte header into Livermore's frame to help identify the protocol of the data that is contained in the payload of the frame.

41> Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livermore and Jha, in further view of in view of Flanders et al, U.S Patent No. 6,172,980 ["Flanders"].

42> As to claim 17, Livermore discloses that his network is suited for transporting data of extraneous standards [column 6 <lines 47-51>], but does not explicitly disclose that the extraneous standard corresponds to the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) standard.

43> Flanders teaches a data telegram wherein the extraneous standard is TCP [column 7

<lines 12-14>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement TCP as the extraneous standard for Livermore's data telegram, as TCP is a ubiquitous standard in the network arts.

44> As to claim 19, Livermore discloses that his network is suited for transporting data of extraneous standards and especially packets [column 6 <lines 47-51>], but does not explicitly disclose that the extraneous standard corresponds to the Internet Packet Exchange protocol (IPX) standard.

45> Flanders teaches a data telegram wherein the extraneous standard is IPX [column 6 <lines 8-11>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement IPX as the extraneous standard for Livermore's data telegram, as IPX is a ubiquitous standard in the network arts.

46> Claims 21-26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the MOST spec, in view of Jha, in further view of Saito.

47> As to claim 21, the MOST spec discloses a data telegram for transmitting data in accordance with a MOST protocol in a MOST network, the data telegram comprising:
a data section containing data formatted in accordance with a prescribable extraneous standard that is different than the MOST standard [section 2.5 | sections 5, 6.7, 6.8.(1-4)

where : the MOST standard is compatible with a number of different protocols, the packets of which are transported to the various nodes using the MOST standard].

The MOST spec also discloses a header section [section 5, page 31] but does not explicitly disclose that the header section consists of 5 bytes a predetermined region of which contains information specifying that the data section is formatted according to the extraneous standard.

48> Similar to Livermore, MOST spec is directed towards transporting various data types within container structures [section 6.6, section 9 : "equipment such as multimedia computers, analog audio gateways, multimedia CD players, hi-fi audio equipment, telecommunication terminals...etc, can all be networked to interact"]. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would realize the need for a means of identification of the data stored in the containers so the destination nodes are aware of the kind of data they are receiving. Jha discloses a network similar to MOST [a hybrid data transport over optical networks], and specifically, a header section having a predetermined region that contains information specifying that the data within the data section are formatted according to the extraneous standard [column 7 «lines 46-49»]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Jha's header functionality into MOST's header to enable identification of the multiple traffic types (standards) of the data payload.

49> As to the matter of the 5 byte header, the length of a header is merely a design choice and therefore is not a patentable distinction over the prior art. Additionally Saito discloses a

frame header of five bytes [column 1 «line 60» to column 2 «line 1»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the MOST spec's header as a five byte header as taught by Saito to allow the network devices to properly identify the protocol type of the data contained in the payload.

50> As to claim 22, the MOST spec discloses the data telegram of claim 21, wherein the predetermined region in the header section that is otherwise unoccupied in accordance with the MOST protocol [section 5 – page 31 where: the coding field is the predetermined region, and since the field is specifically for indicating the kind of data, it is otherwise unoccupied by any other information besides the coding information].

51> As to claim 23, the MOST spec discloses the data telegram of claim 21, wherein the predetermined region in the header section is reserved for information that is not relevant to the MOST protocol [section 5 – page 31 where: the coding field contains information only about the protocol of the data being carried in the payload].

52> As to claim 24, the MOST spec discloses the data telegram of claim 21, wherein the information is contained in the header section [section 5 – page 31], but does not explicitly state that it is contained in the last byte of the header section.

53> Saito discloses a frame header that stores information of the kind of data in the

last byte of the header section [column 1 «line 60» to column 2 «line 1»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Flanders' header into the MOST header to obtain the advantage of having a fixed location for the protocol identifier in the header; this way, the network devices can quickly locate the protocol type of the data.

54> As to claim 25, the MOST spec discloses the data telegram of claim 21, wherein the extraneous standard is a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) standard [section 2.5 – see “MOST ‘Open’ Model” figure].

55> As to claim 26, the MOST spec discloses the data telegram of claim 21, wherein the extraneous standard is a Internet Protocol (IP) standard [section 2.5, section 9 – see “MOST ‘Open’ Model” figure and “multimedia computers”].

56> As to claim 28, the MOST spec discloses a MOST multimedia system comprising:
a plurality of multimedia devices communicably coupled through a communication path and defining a MOST network, wherein the multimedia devices transmit and receive data telegrams formatted in accordance with a MOST standard [sections 2.1 and 2.4],
wherein the data telegram comprises:

a data section containing data formatted in accordance with a prescribable extraneous standard that is different than the MOST standard [section 2.5 | sections 5, 6.7, 6.8.(1-4)].

The MOST spec also discloses a header section [section 5] but does not specifically disclose a header consisting of five bytes and including a predetermined region that specifies that the data section is formatted according to the extraneous standard.

57> Similar to Livermore, MOST spec is directed towards transporting various data types within container structures [section 6.6, section 9 : "equipment such as multimedia computers, analog audio gateways, multimedia CD players, hi-fi audio equipment, telecommunication terminals...etc, can all be networked to interact"]. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would realize the need for a means of identification of the data stored in the containers so the destination nodes are aware of the kind of data they are receiving. Jha discloses a network similar to MOST [a hybrid data transport over optical networks], and specifically, a header section having a predetermined region that contains information specifying that the data within the data section are formatted according to the extraneous standard [column 7 «lines 46-49»]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Jha's header functionality into MOST's header to enable identification of the multiple traffic types (standards) of the data payload.

58> As to the matter of the 5 byte header, the length of a header is merely a design choice and therefore is not a patentable distinction over the prior art. Additionally Saito discloses a frame header of five bytes [column 1 «line 60» to column 2 «line 1»]. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the MOST spec's header as a five byte header as taught by Saito to allow the network devices to properly identify the protocol type of the data contained in the payload.

59> As to claims 29 and 30, they do not teach or further define over the limitations recited in claims 24-26. Therefore, claims 29 and 30 are also rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 24-26, supra.

60> Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MOST, Jha and Saito, in further view of Flanders.

61> As to claim 27, the MOST spec discloses compatibility with a number of extraneous standards, including IP (see paragraph 32, section 9 : "telecommunication terminals"), but does not explicitly state that the extraneous standard is an Internet Packet Exchange (IPX) protocol standard.

62> Flanders discloses IPX as an extraneous standard for a data telegram [column 6 <lines 8-11>] where IPX and IP are compared to each other as routing protocols. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented IPX as an extraneous standard into the MOST spec as well in addition to IP, as they are both routing protocols, and would have obtained the further advantage of being compatible with IPX.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner